

World View and Theory in Indian Philosophy

Edited by
Piotr Balcerowicz



MANOHAR
2012

**WARSAW INDOLOGICAL STUDIES SERIES
VOLUME 5**

EDITOR:
Piotr Balcerowicz



Cover design: Piotr Balcerowicz
Layout design and fonts, typeset by: Piotr Balcerowicz

Publication co-financed by
the Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Warsaw

First Edition: Delhi, 2012

Copyright © 2012 by PIOTR BALCEROWICZ
All Rights Reserved

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior permission of the editor and the publisher.

ISBN 978-93-5098-012-5

Published by
Ajay Kumar Jain
for
Manohar Publishers & Distributors
4753/23 Ansari Road, Daryaganj
New Delhi 110 002

Printed at
Salasar Imaging Systems
New Delhi 110 035

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	7
Contributors	13

WORLD VIEWS IN CONTENTION AND EXCHANGE

JOHANNES BRONKHORST: Buddhist Thought <i>Versus</i> Brahmanical Thought	21
VINCENT ELTSCHINGER: Apocalypticism, Heresy and Philosophy	29
EMILIO GARCÍA BUENDÍA: Parmenides and the <i>Sat-kārya-vāda</i> Doctrine of Sāṃkhya	87

WORLD VIEWS AND SYSTEMS

ANDREW J. NICHOLSON: Doxography and Boundary-Formation in Late Medieval India	103
LAWRENCE MCCREA: Rationalisation and Sincerity in Mīmāṃsā Hermeneutics	119
TAKANORI SUZUKI: On the Variety of Commentarial Approaches among the Commentators of the <i>Padārtha-dharma-saṃgraha</i> : A Reconsideration of the Notion of the 'Vaiśeṣika School'	137
ERNST PRETS: A Review of the Early Nyāya Fragments	155
PIOTR BALCEROWICZ: When Yoga is not Yoga. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika tradition and the <i>Artha-śāstra</i>	173

WORLD VIEWS AND PERSONS

JONARDON GANERI: Buddhist Individuals and Inward Empathy	249
JOERG TUSKE: Śāntarakṣita on the Emotions	263
JEAN-MARIE VERPOORTEN: Some Aspects of <i>Ātman</i> According to Prabhākara and Śālikanātha	277
TIMOTHY LUBIN: The Polity of the Philosopher-Bureaucrat: Brahmanical Virtue as a Qualification for Public Office	299
SHUJUN MOTEGI: The Concept of Non-Possession in the <i>Mokṣa-dharma</i>	327
PAOLO MAGNONE: <i>Aho kauśalam apūrvam</i> . Hermeneutical wriggings about the <i>Īśōpaniṣad</i>	349

THEORY OF WORLD VIEW

CLAUS OETKE:	
‘World View’ as a Topic of Research in Indian Studies	369
BRENDAN GILLON:	
The Correspondence Principle	381
STEPHEN H. PHILLIPS:	
Cannibalising Nyāya Epistemology	399
HIROSHI MARUI:	
The Meaning of a Diversity of Established World Views or Tenets (<i>siddhānta</i>) in the Science of Debate: With Special Reference to Jayanta’s Interpretation of the <i>Abhyupagama-siddhānta</i> (NS 1.1.31) and its Evaluation in the Development of Nyāya System	407
GENERAL INDEX	433

A Review of the Early Nyāya Fragments*

ERNST PRETS

The early school of Nyāya, as one of the orthodox Hindu philosophies, is mainly represented by commentaries on the school's founding text, the *Nyāya-sūtra*, which is ascribed to the sage Akṣapāda (? second century CE) and was most probably finalised in its classical form by anonymous redactors in the first half of the fifth century.¹ The four main preserved commentaries and sub-commentaries, the so-called *Nyāya-catur-granthikā*, are the *Nyāya-bhāṣya* of Pakṣilasvāmin Vātsyāyana (fifth century CE), the *Nyāya-vārttika* of Bhāradvāja Uddyotakara (second half of the sixth century), the *Nyāya-vārttika-tātparyā-īkā* of Vācaspatimiśra (tenth century), and the *Nyāya-vārttika-tātparyā-pariśuddhi* of Udayana (eleventh century). Jayantabhaṭṭa's *Nyāya-mañjarī* (ninth century) and Bhāsarvajña's *Nyāya-bhūṣaṇa* (tenth century) are not direct commentaries on the *Nyāya-sūtra*. The *Nyāya-mañjarī* is a synopsis of the sixteen Nyāya topics, and the *Nyāya-bhūṣaṇa* is an auto-commentary on Bhāsarvajña's *Nyāya-sāra*. In addition to these, however, there must have been a considerable corpus of other works within the Nyāya tradition written during the second half of the first millennium that have not survived. We know for example that the *Nyāya-bhāṣya* was commented on by a number of early Naiyāyikas of whom only their names, titles of works, or fragments have survived.

These fragments have not been studied as a whole, nor have the fragments from individual periods been examined from the viewpoint of their historical interdependence or mutual dependence as based on their contents. They have only been studied with regard to either single authors, or within the framework of a particular group of authors.

An analysis of the fragments and doxographies would be highly important, since relevant developmental steps in the Nyāya system's concepts are often documented only indirectly in the four major commentaries. These basic concepts often seem to be related to authors whose works are lost. This assump-

* Work on this paper has been generously supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) in the context of the FWF project P 20935–G15 ('Fragments of the Nyāya School of Philosophy'). I would like to express my gratitude to Cynthia Peck-Kubaczek for having taken a close look at my English.

¹ Cf. PREISENDANZ (2005: 56).

tion is substantiated by the fact that such concepts are often referred to in the works of authors of opposing schools and systems. The great Buddhist philosopher Dharmakīrti (ca. 600–660), for example, refers apart from Uddyotakara to lost Nyāya works in the polemical sections of his *Vāda-nyāya*, as does Śāntarakṣita in his commentary thereon.² As another example, it has been shown that Jayantabhaṭṭa bases his work on two Nyāya branches that are different from the extant commentaries of Pakṣilasvāmin and Uddyotakara. Accordingly, it is clear that lost Nyāya works were important for the philosophical development of Nyāya before the time of Jayantabhaṭṭa.

The first Indological study dealing with a more differentiated history of Nyāya was carried out already in 1936 by Erich Frauwallner.³ In this article he convincingly shows that Jayantabhaṭṭa's *Nyāya-mañjarī* is mainly based on sources by later Nyāya authors from the time of Dharmakīrti. FRAUWALLNER reveals two sources of the *Nyāya-mañjarī*, namely the works of the so-called *ācāryāḥ* ('the teachers') and *vyākhyātāraḥ* ('the explainers'). These works are different from the preserved commentaries, both written before Dharmakīrti, the *Nyāya-bhāṣya* and the *Nyāya-vārttika*.

Amongst other authors presenting studies on Nyāya fragments,⁴ Anantalal Thakur, in particular, contributed in 1953 to a differentiated history of Nyāya with his article 'Some Lost Nyāya Works and Authors',⁵ as well as in his later series of studies on different 'lost' authors and works.⁶

In 1961, Ernst Steinkellner summarised earlier research results and presented a number of new consolidated findings in his article 'Die Literatur des älteren Nyāya'.⁷ In addition, he tried to develop a chronology of the Naiyāyikas. He acted on the assumption that such a classification could be based on the discussions of the respective Naiyāyikas with the Buddhist teachers Dignāga (480–540 CE) and Dharmakīrti.⁸ Accordingly, he restructured the Nyāya School into three groups: (1) teachers and their works before Dignāga, to which he counted the legendary Akṣapāda's *Nyāya-sūtra* (NS) and Pakṣilasvāmin's *Nyāya-bhāṣya* (NBh); (2) teachers between Dignāga and Dharmakīrti.

² Cf. e.g. Vip 142.28: *uddiyotakara-prīticandra(?)bhāvivikta-prabhṛtiḥ* in commenting on 'uneducated people' in VN 68.12: *durvidagdho jano*.

³ FRAUWALLNER (1936).

⁴ Cf. Benoytosh Bhattacharyya's introduction to his edition of the *Tattva-saṃgraha* (v. TSa); BHATTACHARYA (1946) on Śrīvatsācārya; BHATTACHARYA (1958); KAVIRAJ (1961).

⁵ Cf. THAKUR (1953).

⁶ Cf. THAKUR (1947) on Trilocana; THAKUR (1955) on Trilocana as the teacher of Vācaspati; THAKUR (1958–1959) on Viśvarūpa. Cf. also Thakur's introductions to the works of Jñānaśrī (*Jñānaśrīmitra-nibandhāvali*; JNA) and Ratnakīrti (*Ratnakīrti-nibandhāvali*; RNA), which contain many fragments, mainly of discussions between the Nyāya School and Dharmakīrti.

⁷ STEINKELLNER (1961).

⁸ STEINKELLNER (1961: 150).

kīrti, whose discussions were shaped by their debates with Dignāga and also with his teacher Vasubandhu, to whom he counted Uddyotakara with his *Nyāya-vārttika* (NV), Bhāvivikta, and Aviddhakarṇa; (3) teachers after Dharmakīrti, who discussed Dharmakīrti's teachings in detail, to which he counted in chronological order the following authors: Śaṅkarasvāmin,⁹ Trilocana, his pupil¹⁰ Vācaspatimiśra (NVTṬ), Viśvarūpa, Jayantabhaṭṭa (NMa), Bhāsarvajña (NSā, NBhūṣ), Aniruddha (NBhVṬVi), Adhyayana, Vittoka, Narasiṃha, Śrīvatsācārya, and Udayana (NVTP). In connection with his study of Nyāya fragments, STEINKELLNER also alluded to important aspects regarding the quotations in Kamalaśīla's *Tattva-saṃgraha-pañjikā* (TSaP), aspects that should generally be observed when working with fragments.¹¹

About the same time, Gerhard Oberhammer was engaged in extracting and identifying the sources, no longer extant, of Jayantabhaṭṭa and Uddyotakara with regard to inference (*anumāna*, ad NS 1.1.5) and the members of proof (*avayava*, ad NS 1.1.32–39).¹² In his comparison of the two authors' sources, he concluded that Dignāga's logical ideas must have been extensively discussed in Nyāya circles already during Uddyotakara's lifetime. Uddyotakara must therefore have been only one individual in a group of Naiyāyikas of his time, and was probably not even the most important among them. Oberhammer observed further that Jayantabhaṭṭa's sources may be identified with the Nyāya *ācāryāḥ* and the *vyākhyātāraḥ*, even though they are not explicitly mentioned in the context under consideration. He guessed that both sources must have been known to Uddyotakara, which would lead to the assumption that they must have lived before him. He further guessed that the *vyākhyātāraḥ* might be identical with the Nyāya author Bhāvivikta.

In his dissertation of 1963 on the concept of perception in the *Nyāya-mañjarī* (NMa), Brahmānanda Gupta thoroughly investigated Jayantabhaṭṭa's Nyāya sources.¹³ He concluded that these sources can be identified with two authors from the period after Pakṣilasvāmin, namely an *ācārya* (teacher) and a *vyākhyātr* (explainer). He further argued that it is likely that they both wrote commentaries on the *Nyāya-bhāṣya* (*Bhāṣya-ṭīkā*),¹⁴ these commentaries then becoming

⁹ In the context of the mentioned study, Steinkellner, with his unpublished dissertation, undertook an attempt, as yet the first, at a critical study of one of the important Nyāya teachers after Dharmakīrti.

¹⁰ Cf. THAKUR (1947); SOLOMON (1986).

¹¹ Cf. STEINKELLNER (1963); cf. also the comments of Eli FRANCO (1991: 156) on Cārvāka fragments.

¹² Cf. OBERHAMMER (1962); cf. also OBERHAMMER (1964), in which he deals with the theory of logical nexus of another 'lost' Naiyāyika, namely Trilocana.

¹³ Cf. GUPTA (1963).

¹⁴ Cf. GUPTA (1963: 24 and 97 ff.).

the starting point of two different Nyāya sub-schools.¹⁵ In addition, he assumed that Uddyotakara was an adherent of the Vyākhyāṭr School, whereas Śāṅkarasvāmin must have been an adherent of the Ācārya School.

The first editions of the only known commentary on the *Nyāya-mañjarī*, the *Nyāya-mañjarī-granthi-bhaṅga* (NMaGBh) of Cakradhara (twelfth century), and Bhāsarvajña's *Nyāya-bhūṣaṇa* (NBhūṣ) have shed some light on the problem of Jayantabhaṭṭa's sources. On the basis of these new editions, Albrecht Wezler¹⁶ in 1975 was able to confirm GUPTA's assumption that the expressions *ācārya* and *vyākhyāṭr* referred to two different authors, since Cakradhara explains that the *ācāryāḥ*, beginning with Rucikāra, were commentators on Uddyotakara, and the *vyākhyātāraḥ*, beginning with a certain Pravara,¹⁷ were commentators on the *Nyāya-bhāṣya*. GUPTA's theory was only to be corrected in so far as the *ācāryāḥ* were not commentators on the *Nyāya-bhāṣya*, but rather commentators on the *Nyāya-vārttika*. The name Rucikāra could thus only refer to Adhyayana, also known as Adhyayanapāda, who wrote a *Rucī-ṭikā*.¹⁸ According to the *Nyāya-bhūṣaṇa*, Adhyayana is referred to as *ācārya*, and fragments of Viśvarūpa and other commentators of the *Nyāya-bhāṣya* are quoted by using the verb *vyācakṣate*, a fact that at least could hint to their identification with *vyākhyātāraḥ*.¹⁹

In the 1970s and 1980s it was mainly Indian scholars who contributed to the history of early so-called lost Naiyāyikas,²⁰ foremost among them Esther Solomon, who in a series of short articles²¹ dealt with numerous fragments of

¹⁵ GUPTA (1963: 24). This assumption has been criticised by H. von Stietencron. He doubted this opinion and presumed that possibly not individual teachers are meant, but the teachings of different teachers who could even belong to different schools. Cf. the review of GUPTA's study by Heinrich von STIETENCRON (1969).

¹⁶ Cf. WEZLER (1975).

¹⁷ Cf. Wezler's translation of the first instance of the *ācāryāḥ* as mentioned by Cakradhara (NMaGBh 44.12–14: *atrācāryās tāvad iti vakṣyamāṇa-vyākhyāṭr-matāpekṣayā tāvac chabda-prayogaḥ. iha ca sarvatrācārya-śabdena uddyotakara-vivṛti-kṛto rucikāra-prabhṛtayo vivakṣitāḥ, vyākhyāṭr-śabdena ca bhāṣya-vivaraṇa-kṛtaḥ pravara-prabhṛtaya iti.*) in WEZLER (1975: 137): 'In Bezug darauf vertreten die Lehrer—um mit ihnen zu beginnen—die [folgende] Ansicht: [Jayanta] gebraucht das Wort *tāvat* ("um mit ihnen zu beginnen") im Hinblick auf die Anschauung der "Erklärer", die er [anschließend] darlegen wird. Und hier (d.h. in der NMa) sind in jedem einzelnen Fall mit dem Wort "die Lehrer" die Verfasser von Kommentaren [zum *Nyāya-vārttika*] des Uddyotakara, voran der Rucikāra, gemeint, und mit dem Wort "die Erklärer" die Verfasser von Kommentaren zum [*Nyāya*]-*Bhāṣya*, von denen Pravara der erste ist.'

¹⁸ Cf. STEINKELLNER (1961: 160).

¹⁹ WEZLER (1975: 140).

²⁰ Cf. HEGDE (1981) on Udbhaṭa; HEGDE (1983) on Bhāvivikta. In the latter article, HEDGE (1981: 30 ff.) is of the opinion that there must have been two Bhāviviktas, one a Naiyāyika who wrote a commentary on the *Nyāya-bhāṣya*, and an earlier Bhāvivikta who was a Cārvāka.

²¹ Cf. SOLOMON (1970), (1971) and (1972) on Aviddhakarṇa; SOLOMON (1974b) on Adhayayna; SOLOMON (1974a) on Bhāvivikta; SOLOMON (1976) on Viśvarūpa; SOLOMON

authors of the Nyāya School, albeit without referring to the European discussion on the topic.²² In her article on Aviddhakarṇa, she supports the opinion that he must have been an adherent of a tradition of commentators other than the tradition of Uddyotakara or Bhāvivikta, because his name is never mentioned together with the latter two. His *Tattva-ṭikā* might have been written before Uddyotakara and probably is a commentary on the *Nyāya-bhāṣya*.²³ She conjectures further that, in addition to his commentary on the Lokāyata works *Lokāyata-sūtra* and *Paurandara-sūtra*, Bhaṭṭodbhaṭa probably wrote a commentary on the *Nyāya-sūtra*.²⁴

The second volume of the *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies* (EIPh II) should also be mentioned, as it also includes articles on the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika tradition, although the editor, Karl Potter, does not give much attention to fragments of lost works. He summarises chronologically the history of Nyāya as follows: Bhāvivikta before Uddyotakara; Prīticandra, Aviddhakarṇa, Śāṅkara(svāmin), Viśvarūpa and Dhairyaśi before Jayantabhaṭṭa; Trilocana and Sānātani before Vācaspati; Adhyayana, Vittoka, Narasimha and Śrīvatsa between Vācaspati and Udayana.

Finally, a recent article by Hiroshi MARUI (2006) contributes to the discussion concerning the *ācāryāḥ* and the *vyākhyātāraḥ*. Here, he carefully examines the respective passages of the *Nyāya-mañjarī* in which the *ācāryāḥ* and *vyākhyātāraḥ* are quoted. His methodologically and philologically interesting study provides new evidence to support the plural *ācāryāḥ* as being a line of Nyāya scholars who must be seen as having been Jayanta's main sources.

Summarising the above, under the presupposition that the Buddhist authors Dignāga and Dharmakīrti can help us determine the chronology of the Nyāya authors, one can suppose the following situation: Aviddhakarṇa, the author of a *Bhāṣya-ṭikā* and a *Tattva-ṭikā*, and Bhāvivikta, the author of again a *Bhāṣya-ṭikā*, must have lived with certainty before Dharmakīrti and most probably after Dignāga. Also included in this period is Prīticandra, about whose identity nothing is known other than Śāntarakṣita's statement that Dharmakīrti understood him to be an opponent.²⁵ The early fragments of the *ācāryāḥ* and the *vyākhyātāraḥ* should, in any case, be placed before or, at the latest, at the time of Dharmakīrti. Of the *ācāryāḥ* who are said to have written commentaries on

(1978) on Bhaṭṭa Udbhaṭa; SOLOMON (1978a) and (1979) on Śāṅkara; SOLOMON (1979a) on Vittoka; SOLOMON (1980) and (1986) on Trilocana.

²² Since Solomon does not mention any articles published by European scholars before (1986), it may be ruled out that she considered them.

²³ SOLOMON (1972: 351f.).

²⁴ SOLOMON (1978: 990 ff.).

²⁵ Cf. Vip 142.27 f.: ... ity āha durvidagdhaḥ samyag-viveka-rahitatayā jano 'yam uddyotakara-prīticandra(?) -bhāvivikta-prabhṛtiḥ. According to Śāntarakṣita, Dharmakīrti refers in his *Vāda-nyāya* to three Nyāya authors, namely Uddyotakara, Bhāvivikta, and Aviddhakarṇa. It seems that Śāntarakṣita may refer to Aviddhakarṇa by the name Prīticandra (?).

the *Nyāya-vārttika*, at least Adhyayana[pāda], who wrote the *Ruci-ṭikā* and therefore was also called Rucikāra, can be identified. Head of the *vyākhyātāraḥ*, most probably commentators on the *Nyāya-bhāṣya*, is according to Cakradhara's *Nyāya-mañjarī-granthi-bhaṅga* a certain Pravara, who might be identical with one of the other known authors of his tradition. Bhaṭṭodbhaṭa, author of a *Tattva-vṛtti*, a commentary on the Lokāyata *Paurandara-sūtra*, must have lived before Jayantabhaṭa. Whether he should be considered part of the wider circle of Naiyāyikas or not cannot be decided with any degree of certainty. Śaṅkara-svāmin certainly belongs to the period after Dharmakīrti. He is said to be the author of a **Kṣaṇa-bhaṅga-siddhi-dūṣaṇa* and an **Īśvara-siddhi*. According to STEINKELLNER (1977), he most probably lived between 720/30 and 780/90. Trilocana, the teacher of Vācaspati, is the author of another *Nyāya-mañjarī*, which is probably identical to his *Nyāya-bhāṣya-ṭikā*. Moreover, he is the author of a work called *Nyāya-prakīrṇaka*. Viśvarūpa, who also wrote a *Nyāya-bhāṣya-ṭikā*, and Dhairyaśāsi may have been contemporaries of Jayantabhaṭa, or may have lived and worked shortly before his lifetime. A certain Tausala is quoted by Bhāsarvajña in his *Nyāya-bhūṣaṇa*. Śrīvatsācārya, who wrote a *Līlāvatī*, and Sānātani are quoted by Udayana. The earliest quotes of Nara-simha, Śātānanda, Vittoka, Vatsesvara and Śaśāṅkadhara (who wrote a commentary on Viśvarūpa's *Viśva-rūpa-ṭikā* = *Nyāya-bhāṣya-ṭikā*) can be found in the works of Jñānaśrī and Ratnakīrti (cf. Appendix, p. 163).

A critical investigation of the fragments of this eminent period of Nyāya should also clarify the branching of the various traditions within the school, a question that to date has not been sufficiently considered by the international scholarly community. The collected fragmentary material of lost works will probably also shed some general light on questions of chronology, not only within the Nyāya School, but also on authors of other traditions who refer to this body of thought.

Uddyotakara's *Nyāya-vārttika* is the first extant Nyāya work that offers an interesting insight into the discussions of his period, because he responds to the new epistemological, logical, and dialectical activities of Vasubandhu and Dignāga. The Nyāya scholars found themselves forced to argue against these Buddhist teachers, developing and adapting the innovative Buddhist ideas for their own purposes.²⁶ Uddyotakara is not only engaged in adapting and refuting the Buddhist authors, but also refers to deviant opinions of Nyāya teachers following Pakṣilasvāmin.

The two Nyāya authors Bhāvivikta and Aviddhakarṇa must have been close contemporaries of Uddyotakara. They are both said to have written commentaries on the *Nyāya-bhāṣya*. There were probably also other representatives of the *vyākhyātāraḥ* during this period, the first said to be Pravara, as well as at least one author of the *ācāryāḥ*, namely Adhyayana, who as mentioned above

²⁶ Cf. e.g. WEZLER (1969).

wrote a *Ruci-ṭīkā*. And, there are other authors of whom we know little more than their names, such as Prīticandra (see above), who definitely lived before Dharmakīrti.

All these studies and investigations have yielded new results concerning the lost Naiyāyikas' works, but have also uncovered a number of difficulties that present themselves when working with fragments of lost works. Methodologically, working with fragments poses a challenge. When examining 'quotations' of authors whose works have been lost, it is often necessary to consider fragments from various sources, including other religious and philosophical traditions. In order to deal with the material of a particular tradition—and often, even each author within a particular tradition—an awareness must be maintained of the historical circumstances surrounding that tradition, as has been pointed out by STEINKELLNER in his remarks concerning methodology when examining the Buddhist *pramāṇa* tradition.²⁷ Determining the authenticity of a fragmentary text passage, even if the quoting author has identified it as a quotation, can only be undertaken with caution, not only with respect to the wording, but also the contents. Since it is exceedingly rare to find the favourable case of the same passage quoted in more than one place, it must be assumed the original intentions may have been distorted. There can be various reasons for such distortions, including the author being consentient or hostile, how the passage fits into the context, or how it relates to the polemical discussion in which the passage is quoted. It has been clearly shown by STEINKELLNER, in his article concerning the manner of Uddyotakara's *Nyāya-vārttika* being quoted in Kamalaśīla's *Tattva-saṃgraha-pañjikā*,²⁸ that in some cases Kamalaśīla quotes verbatim, but in others he adapts the wording to the context. In still other cases, he quotes equivalent passages of several Nyāya authors, or sources that are common to Uddyotakara and others, and he always includes a discussion of the meaning of such citations.²⁹ Under such circumstances, an evaluation of fragment material must be based on many factors, including the wording, content, authenticity, personal and historical classification etc. For this reason, a collection of fragments requires minute and systematic documentation. The manner in which authors quote other material is often unique to the work in question, and therefore when evaluating these quotes one must also provisionally rely on external criteria, such as the formal style of quoting, the order of the quotations,³⁰ the manner in which other authors or schools are designated or left anonymous etc. Indeed, leaving a

²⁷ Cf. STEINKELLNER (1988: 103).

²⁸ Cf. STEINKELLNER (1963).

²⁹ STEINKELLNER (1963: 144 f.).

³⁰ Cf. e.g. TSaP 188.10 in STEINKELLNER (1963: 119): *udyotakara-bhāviviktādayo ... udbhāvayanti*.

quote anonymous sometimes provides information concerning the degree to which the opinion being quoted is accepted.³¹

Another specific feature is to differentiate between the various ways that lost works are attested to. In some cases, the diction of a lost work has been preserved as a quote or it is paraphrased, in other cases, a thought from a lost work is merely alluded to. The term ‘fragment’ is understood as a text passage that not only reflects a thought or an idea from a lost work, but also most likely retains the distinct wording of an earlier theory, this having been incorporated verbatim into the work that preserves it.

The identification of external textual material in a certain work requires a high degree of familiarity not only with the compositional style of its author, but also, especially, with how the same author clarifies particular topics in other works, and how these same topics are discussed within his tradition and by its opponents. In-depth knowledge of these aspects is an indispensable prerequisite for judging whether an author has included a passage from another work into his text. In the process of collecting the information needed for identifying fragments, it is helpful to systematically classify the different types of embedded textual material according to quantitative or qualitative criteria.³²

³¹ Cf. THIEME (1956: 587): ‘Now, there is a difference between the expression *kecit* “certain [scholars]”, which the *Kāśikā* uses ... and *apare* “others”. ... The first, quite commonly with the later Pāṇinīyas, refers to scholars whose opinion is not accepted, the second to those whose opinion is considered, if not always definitely correct, at least preferable to the one stated before. We should, if wishing to be quite precise, translate *kecit* by “certain [scholars, whose opinion I do not accept]”, *apare* by “others [whose opinion is preferable]”.’

³² Quantitative assessment of corresponding passages pertains to the various degrees of verbatim correspondence. Qualitative assessment of correspondence pertains to the mode of reference to an embedded passage and to the succession of transmission.

APPENDIX

Synopsis of ‘lost’ Nyāya authors’ works

The list contains a synopsis of who are known only through fragments. Listed below are the respective names of such authors, and the works, with their authors, that contain fragments, as based on the current stage of research.

A d h y a y a n a / A d h y a n a p ā d a / R u c i k ā r a :

- Tattva-bodha-vidhāyinī* (Abhayadeva)
- Dharmottara-pradīpa* (Durvekamiśra)
- Nyāya-bhūṣaṇa* (Bhāsarvajña)
- Nyāya-mañjarī-granthi-bhaṅga* (Cakradhara)
- Pramāṇa-vārttika-sva-vṛtti-ṭīkā* (Karṇakagomin) *Adhyanapāda*

A v i d d h a k a r ṇ a :

- Tattva-bodha-vidhāyinī* (Abhayadeva)
- Tattva-saṃgraha* (Śāntarakṣita)
- Tattva-saṃgraha-pañjikā* (Kamalaśīla)
- Pramāṇa-vārttika-sva-vṛtti-ṭīkā* (Karṇakagomin)
- Vāda-nyāya* (Dharmakīrti)
- Vipañcitārthā = Vāda-nyāya-ṭīkā* (Śāntarakṣita)
- Siddhi-viniścaya-ṭīkā* (Anantavīryācārya)

Ā c ā r y ā ḥ / V y ā k h y ā t ā r a ḥ :

- Nyāya-bhūṣaṇa* (Bhāsarvajña)
- Nyāya-mañjarī* (Jayantabhaṭṭa)
- Nyāya-mañjarī-granthi-bhaṅga* (Cakradhara)
- Vyomavatī* (Vyomaśiva)

T a u s a l a :

- Nyāya-bhūṣaṇa* (Bhāsarvajña)

T r i l o c a n a :

- Abhisamayālaṅkāraloka* (Haribhadra)
- Ātma-tattva-viveka* (Udayana)
- Ṛju-vimalā-pañcikā* (Śālikanātha)
- Jñānaśrīmitra-nibandhāvali: Apoha-prakaraṇa, Īśvara-vāda, Kṣaṇa-bhaṅgādhyāya, Vyāpti-caricā* (Jñānaśrīmitra)
- Tarka-bhāṣā* (Mokṣākaragupta)
- Tārkika-rakṣā* (Varadarāja)

Daśa-sāhasrikā (Prajñāpāramitā)
Dharmottara-pradīpa (Durvekamiśra)
Nyāya-kaṇikā (Vācaspati)
Nyāya-nibandha-prakāśa (Vardhamāna)
Nyāya-bhāṣya-vārttika-ṭīkā-vivaraṇa-pañjikā (Aniruddha)
Nyāya-bhūṣaṇa (Bhāsarvajña)
Nyāya-mañjarī (Jayantabhaṭṭa)
Nyāya-ratna-mālā (Pārthasārathimiśra)
Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā (Vācaspati)
Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-pariśuddhi (Udayana)
Nyāya-viniścaya-vivaraṇa (Vādirāja-sūri)
Nyāya-sāra-vicāra (Bhaṭṭa Rāghava)
Prakaraṇa-pañcikā (Śālikanātha)
Pramāṇa-mīmāṃsā (Hemacandra)
Ratnakīrti-nibandhâvali: Apoha-siddhi, Citrâdvaita-prakāśa-vāda, Īśvara-sādhana-dūṣaṇa, Kṣaṇa-bhaṅga-siddhi, Pramāṇântar-bhāva-prakaraṇa, Sarvajña-siddhi, Sthira-siddhi-dūṣaṇa, Vyāpti-nirṇaya (Ratnakīrti)
Śloka-vārttika-vyākhyā/Tātparya-ṭīkā (Umbeka)
Subhāṣita-ratna-kośa (Vidyākara)
Syād-vāda-ratnākara (Vāḍideva-sūri)

Dhairya-rāṣi:

Āgama-ḍambara (Jayantabhaṭṭa)

Narasimha:

Jnānaśrīmitra-nibandhâvali
Ratnakīrti-nibandhâvali: Īśvara-sādhana-dūṣaṇa (Ratnakīrti)
Khaṇḍanôddhāra (Vācaspati II)
Sārâvalī (Vāsudevasārvabhauma)

Pravara / Prāvarāḥ:

Nyāya-mañjarī (Jayantabhaṭṭa)
Nyāya-mañjarī-granthi-bhaṅga (Cakradhara)

Prīticandra:

Vipañcitârthā = Vāda-nyāya-ṭīkā (Śāntarakṣita)

Bhaṭṭodbhaṭṭa:

Nyāya-mañjarī (Jayantabhaṭṭa)
Nyāya-mañjarī-granthi-bhaṅga (Cakradhara)
Syād-vāda-ratnākara (Vāḍideva-sūri)

Bhāvivikta:

Tattva-saṃgraha (Śāntarakṣita)
Tattva-saṃgraha-pañjikā (Kamalaśīla)
Nyāya-mañjarī (Jayantabhaṭṭa)
Nyāya-mañjarī-granthi-bhaṅga (Cakradhara)
Vāda-nyāya (Dharmakīrti)
Vipañcitārthā = Vāda-nyāya-ṭīkā (Śāntarakṣita)

Rucikāra (see Adhyayana):**Vatseśvara:**

Tattva-cintā-maṇi (Gaṅgeśa)
Nyāya-siddhānta-mālā (Jayarāmanyāyapañcānana)
Tattva-cintā-maṇy-āloka-kaṇṭhakôddhāra (Madhusūdanamiśra)
Tattva-cintā-maṇy-āloka (Pakṣadharamiśra)
Tattva-cintā-maṇi-ṭīkā (Pragalbhamiśra)

Vittoka:

Jñānaśrīmitra-nibandhāvali (Jñānaśrīmitra)
Ratnakīrti-nibandhāvali: Īśvara-sādhana-dūṣaṇa (Ratnakīrti)

Viśvarūpa:

Nyāya-bhāṣya-vārttika-ṭīkā-vivaraṇa-pañjikā (Aniruddha)
Dharmottara-pradīpa (Durvekamiśra)
Āgama-ḍambara (Jayantabhaṭṭa)
Vivaraṇa-prameya-saṃgraha (? Mādhava/Vidyāraṇya/Bhāratīrtha)
Nyāya-viniścaya-vivaraṇa (Vādirāja-sūri)
Tarkika-rakṣā (Varadarāja)
Tārkaika-rakṣā-sāra-saṃgraha
Vibhāvanā (Vedātman)

Vyākhyātāraḥ (see Ācāryāḥ):**Śaṅkarācārya / Śaṅkara:**

Āpta-parīkṣā (Vidyānanda)
Khaṇḍanôddhāra (Vācaspati II)
Jñānaśrīmitra-nibandhāvali: Kṣaṇa-bhaṅgādhyāya (Jñānaśrīmitra)
Tattva-bodha-vidhāyini (Abhayadeva)
Tattva-saṃgraha (Śāntarakṣita)
Tattva-saṃgraha-pañjikā (Kamalaśīla)
Dharmottara-pradīpa (Durvekamiśra)
Nyāya-mañjarī (Jayantabhaṭṭa)

Nyāya-mañjarī-granthi-bhaṅga (Cakradhara)
Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭikā (Vācaspati)
Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-pariśuddhi (Udayana)
Pramāṇa-vārttika-bhāṣya (Prajñākaragupta)
Pramāṇa-vārttika-sva-vṛtti-ṭikā (Kaṇvakagomin)
Bṛhat-kathā-mañjarī (Kṣemendra)
Ratnakīrti-nibandhâvali: Īśvara-sādhana-dūṣaṇa, Kṣaṇa-bhaṅga-siddhi, Sthira-siddhi-dūṣaṇa (Ratnakīrti)
Vāda-nyāya (Dharmakīrti)
Vipaṇcitârthā = Vāda-nyāya-ṭikā (Śāntarakṣita)
Syād-vāda-ratnākara (Vādīdeva)
Hetu-bindu-ṭikā (Arcaṭa)

Śatānanda:

Jñānaśrīmitra-nibandhâvali (Jñānaśrīmitra)

Śaśāṅkadhara:

Nyāya-mañjarī-granthi-bhaṅga (Cakradhara)

Śrīkaṇṭha:

Ṣaḍ-darśana-samuccaya (Guṇaratna)

Śrīvatsâcārya:

Nyāya-siddhānta-mālā (Jayarāmanyāyapañcānana)
Nyāya-kandalī-ṭikā (Rājaśekhara)
Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-pariśuddhi (Udayana)

Sānātani:

Nyāya-siddhānta-mālā (Jayarāmanyāyapañcānana)
Vādi-vinoda (Śaṅkaramiśra)
Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-pariśuddhi (Udayana)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BHATTACHARYA 1946 = Bhattacharya, D.C.: 'Śrīvatsācārya, a long forgotten Naiyāyika', *The Historical Quarterly* 22 (1946) 152–154.
- BHATTACHARYA 1958 = Bhattacharya, D.C.: *History of Navya-Nyāya in Mithilā*. Mithila Institute Series 3/2, Darbhanga Press, Darbhanga 1958.
- DhPr = Durvekamiśra: *Dharmottara-pradīpa*. Dalsukhbhai Malvania (ed.): *Paṇḍita Durveka Miśra's Dharmottarapradīpa [Being a Sub-Commentary on Dharmottara's Nyāyabinduṭīkā, a Commentary on Dharmakīrti's Nyāyabindu]*. Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna 1955.
- EIPh II = Potter, Karl H. (ed.): *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies. Indian Metaphysics and Epistemology*. Vol. II: *The Tradition of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika up to Gaṅgeśa*. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1977.
- FRANCO 1991 = Franco, Eli: 'Paurandarasūtra', in: M.A. Dhaky (ed.) *Pt. Dalsukhbhai Malvaniya Felicitation Volume, Aspects of Jainology* 3, Varanasi: P.V. Research Institute 1991, Vol. 1: 154–163.
- FRAUWALLNER 1936 = Frauwallner, Erich: 'Beiträge zur Geschichte des Nyāya. I. Jayanta und seine Quellen', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 43 (1936) 263–278. [= *Kleine Schriften*. Hrsg. von Gerhard Oberhammer und Ernst Steinkellner, Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden 1982: 145–160].
- GUPTA 1963 = Gupta, Brahmānanda: *Die Wahrnehmungslehre in der Nyāya-mañjarī*. Verlag für Orientkunde Dr. H. Vorndran, Walldorf-Hessen 1963.
- HBṬ = Arcaṭabhaṭṭa: *Hetu-bindu-ṭīkā*. Pandit S. Sanghvi, Muni Shri Jinavijayaji (eds.): *Hetubinduṭīkā of Bhaṭṭa Arcaṭa with the Sub-commentary Entitled Āloka of Durveka Miśra*. Baroda Oriental Institute, Baroda 1949.
- HEGDE 1981 = Hegde, R.D.: 'Identity of Udbhaṭa and His Infinity Theory of Epistemological Proofs', *The Mysore Orientalist* 14 (1981), 103–114. = *ABORI* 67 (1987) 35–45.
- HEGDE 1983 = Hegde, R.D.: 'Bhāvivikta and His Metaphysical Objectivism', *Glory of India. A Quarterly on Indology* 6 (1983) 29–36.
- JNA = Jñānaśrīmitra: *Jñānaśrīmitra-nibandhāvalī*. Anantalal Thakur (ed.): *Jñānaśrīmitra-nibandhāvalī—Buddhist Philosophical Works of Jñānaśrīmitra*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 5, Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna 1987 [first edition: Patna 1956].
- KAVIRAJ 1961 = Kaviraj, G.: *Gleanings from the History and Bibliography of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika Literature*. Indian Studies, Past & Present, Distributors, Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyaya, Calcutta 1961 (Reprinted).
- MARUI 2006 = Marui, Hiroshi: 'Some notes on the controversies between the "ācāryāḥ" and the "vyākhyātaraḥ" in the Nyāyamañjarī', *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 54,3 (2006) 1145–1153 (33–41).

- NBh = Pakṣilasvāmin Vātsyāyana: *Nyāya-bhāṣya*. Anantalal Thakur (ed.): *Gautamiyanyāyadarśana with Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana*. Nyāya-catur-granthikā Vol. I, Indian Council of Philosophical Research, New Delhi 1997.
- NBhūṣ = Bhāsarvajña: *Nyāya-bhūṣaṇa*. Svāmī Yogīndrānanda (ed.): *Śrīmad-ācārya-Bhāsarvajña-praṇītasya Nyāya-sārasya svopajñam vyākhyānam Nyāya-bhūṣaṇam*. Ṣaḍ-darśana-prakāśana-grantha-mālā 1, Ṣaḍ-darśana Prakāśana Pratiṣṭhānam, Vārāṇasī 1968.
- NBhVṬVi = Aniruddha: *Nyāya-bhāṣya-vārttika-ṭīkā-vivaraṇa-pañjikā*. Anantalal Thakur (ed.): *Nyāyabhāṣyavārttikaṭīkāvivaraṇapañjikā [II-V] of Aniruddhācārya*. Mithila Institute Series, Ancient Text 19, Darbhanga Press, Darbhanga 1969.
- NKan = Śrīdharmīśra: *Nyāya-kandalī*. Vindhyeśvarīprasāda Dvivedin (ed.): *The Bhāṣya of Praśastapāda together with the Nyāya-kandalī of Śrīdhara*. Vizianagram Sanskrit Series 6, Benares 1895.
- NMa = Jayantabhaṭṭa: *Nyāya-mañjarī*. K.S. Varadacharya (ed.): *Nyāya-mañjarī of Jayantabhaṭṭa with Ṭippaṇi—Nyāyasaurabha by the Editor*. 2 Vols. Oriental Research Institute Series 116 & 139, University of Mysore, Mysore 1969, 1983.
- NMaGBh = Cakradhara: *Nyāya-mañjarī-granthi-bhaṅga*. Nagin J. Shah (ed.): *Cakradhara's Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga*. L.D. Series 35, L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad 1972.
- NS = Akṣapāda Gautama: *Nyāya-sūtra*. Walter Ruben: *Die Nyāya-sūtra's. Text, Übersetzung, Erläuterung und Glossar*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XVIII/2, Deutsche morgenländische Gesellschaft, Leipzig 1928.
- NSā = Bhāsarvajña: *Nyāya-sāra*. See: NBhūṣ.
- NV = Bhāradvāja Uddyotakara: *Nyāya-vārttika*. Anantalal Thakur (ed.): *Nyāyabhāṣyavārttika of Bhāradvāja Uddyotakara*. Nyāya-catur-granthikā Vol. II, Indian Council of Philosophical Research, New Delhi 1997.
- NVTP = Udayana: *Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-parīśuddhi*. Anantalal Thakur (ed.): *Nyāyavārttikatātparyaparīśuddhi of Udayanācārya*. Nyāya-catur-granthikā Vol. IV, Indian Council of Philosophical Research, New Delhi 1996.
- NVTṬ = Vācaspatimiśra: *Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā*. Anantalal Thakur (ed.): *Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkā of Vācaspatimiśra*. Nyāya-catur-granthikā Vol. III, Indian Council of Philosophical Research, New Delhi 1996.
- OBERHAMMER 1962 = G.Oberhammer, On the Sources in Jayanta Bhaṭṭa and Uddyotakara. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Südasiens* 6 (1962) 91–150.
- OBERHAMMER 1964 = G.Oberhammer, 'Der svābhāvika-sambandha, ein geschichtlicher Beitrag zur Nyāya-Logik', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Südasiens* 8 (1964) 131–181.
- PREISENDANZ 2005 = Preisendanz, Karin: 'The Production of Philosophical Literature in South Asia During the Pre-Colonial Period (15th to 18th Centuries): The Case of the Nyāyasūtra Commentarial Tradition', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 33 (2005) 55–94.

- PVSVṬ = Karṇakagomin: *Pramāṇa-vārttika-(sva)vṛtti-ṭīkā*. Rāhula Sāṃkrtyāyana (ed.): *ācārya-Dharmakīrteḥ Pramāṇavārttikam (svārthānumānaparicchedaḥ) svopajñāvṛtṭyā Karṇakagomiviracitayā Taṭṭīkayā ca sahitam*. Kitāb Mahāl, Ilāhābād [Allahabad] 1943.
- RNA = Ratnakīrti: *Ratnakīrti-nibandhāvali*: Anantalal Thakur (ed.): *Ratnakīrti-Nibandhāvaliḥ (Buddhist Nyāya Works of Ratnakīrti)*. Second edition, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 3; Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna 1975.
- SOLOMON 1970 = Solomon, Esther A.: 'Aviddhakarṇa—A Forgotten Naiyāyika', *Vidya. The Journal of the Gujarat University* 13/1 (1970) 18–40.
- SOLOMON 1971 = Solomon, Esther A.: 'A Further Note on Aviddhakarṇa', *Vidya. The Journal of the Gujarat University* 13/2 (1971) 19–24.
- SOLOMON 1972 = Solomon, Esther A.: 'Aviddhakarṇa—A Forgotten Naiyāyika', in: *Proceedings of the All-India Oriental Conference, Twenty-Fifth Session, Jadavpur University, Calcutta, October 1969*. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona 1972, 337–352.
- SOLOMON 1974a = Solomon, Esther A.: 'Forgotten Nyaiyāyikas: Bhāvivikta', *Vidya. The Journal of the Gujarat University* 17/1 (1974). (foliation not legible).
- SOLOMON 1974b = Solomon, Esther A.: 'Forgotten Nyaiyāyikas: Ācārya Adhayana', *Vidya. The Journal of the Gujarat University* 17/2 (1974). [foliation not legible].
- SOLOMON 1976 = Solomon, Esther A.: 'Forgotten Nyaiyāyikas: Viśvarūpa', *Vidya. The Journal of the Gujarat University* 18/1 (1976) 13–28.
- SOLOMON 1978 = Solomon, Esther A.: 'Bhaṭṭa Udbhaṭa', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 58–59 (1978) 985–992.
- SOLOMON 1978a = Solomon, Esther A.: 'Śaṅkara—A Forgotten Naiyāyika', *Vidya. The Journal of the Gujarat University* 21/2 (1978) 218–234.
- SOLOMON 1979 = Solomon, Esther A.: 'Śaṅkara—A Forgotten Naiyāyika (continued)', *Vidya. The Journal of the Gujarat University* 22/2 (1979) 1–23.
- SOLOMON 1979a = Solomon, Esther A.: 'Vittoka—Poet and Logician', *Indica 16 (Fr. Esteller Felicitation Volume)*. Heras Institute, Bombay 1979, 177–183.
- SOLOMON 1980 = Solomon, Esther A.: 'Trilocana—A Forgotten Naiyāyika', *Vidya. The Journal of the Gujarat University* 23/1 (1980) 17–46.
- SOLOMON 1986 = Solomon, Esther A.: 'Trilocana—A Forgotten Naiyāyika', in: *Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients* 18. *Sanskrit and World Culture. Proceedings of the Fourth World Sanskrit Conference of the International Association of Sanskrit Studies, Weimar May 23–30, 1979*. Ed. by W. Morgenroth. 1986: 560–566.
- STEINKELLNER 1961 = Steinkellner, Ernst: 'Die Literatur des Älteren Nyāya', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Südasiens* 5 (1961) 149–162.
- STEINKELLNER 1963 = Steinkellner, Ernst: 'Zur Zitierweise Kamalaśīla's', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Südasiens* 7 (1963) 116–150.

- STEINKELLNER 1977 = Steinkellner, Ernst: 'On the Date and Works of the Naiyāyika Śaṅkarasvāmin', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 21 (1977) 213–218.
- STEINKELLNER 1988 = Steinkellner, Ernst: 'Methodological Remarks on the Constitution on Sanskrit Texts from the Buddhist *Pramāṇa*-Tradition', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 32 (1988) 103–129.
- von STIETENCROON 1969 = von Stietencron, Heinrich: Review of GUPTA (1963), *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 119 (1969) 215–216.
- STP = Siddhasena Divākara: *Sammati-tarka-prakaraṇa*. Sukhlāl Saṅghavi; Becardās Doṣī (ed.): *Sammatitarka-Prakaraṇa by Siddhasena Divākara. With Abhayadevasūri's Commentary, Tattva-bodhavidhāyinī*. 2 Vols. Reprinted, 2 Vols., Rinsen Buddhist Text Series VI–1, 2; Kyoto 1984 [first edition: Gujarāt-purā-tattva-mandir-granthāvalī 10, 16, 18, 19, 21, Gujarāt-purā-tattva-mandir, Amdāvād 1924–1931].
- SVR = Vādideva-sūri: *Syād-vāda-ratnākara*. Motilāl Lādhājī (ed.): *Śrīmad-Vādideva-sūri-viracitaḥ Pramāṇa-naya-tattvālokāṇkāraḥ tad-vyākhyā ca Syād-vāda-ratnākaraḥ*. Ārḥata-mata-prabhākara 4, Puṇyapattana (Poona) 1926–1930 [*vīra-saṁvat* 2453–57].
- SVṬ = Akalaṅkabhaṭṭa: *Siddhi-viniścaya-ṭīkā*. Mahendrakumār Jain (ed.): *Siddhivinishchayatika of Shri Anantavirya, the Commentary on Siddhivinishchaya and its Vritti of Bhatta Akalanka Deva*. Ed. with 'Aloka' and Introduction etc. by.... 2 Vols., Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Prakāśana, Varanasi 1959.
- TBV = Abhayadeva: *Tattva-bodha-vidhāyinī*. See: STP.
- THAKUR 1947 = Thakur, Anantalal: 'The Naiyāyika Trilocana as Teacher of Vācaspati', *Indian Culture* 14/1 (1947) 36–40.
- THAKUR 1953 = Thakur, Anantalal: 'Some Lost Nyāya Works and Authors', *Proceedings and Transactions of the All-India Oriental Conference* 17, Ahmedabad, October–November 1953. Ahmedabad 1953: 385–394.
- THAKUR 1955 = Thakur, Anantalal: 'Nyāyamañjarī of Guru Trilocana—a Forgotten Work', *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 41 (1955) 507–511.
- THAKUR 1958–59 = Thakur, Anantalal: 'Viśvarūpa the Naiyāyika', *Journal of Oriental Research, Madras* 28 (1958–59) 29–37.
- THIEME 1956 = Thieme, Paul: 'Pāṇini and the Pāṇinīyas', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 76 (1956) 1–23.
- TSa = Śāntarakṣita: *Tattva-saṁgraha*. Embar Krishnamacharya (ed.): *Tattvasaṅgraha of Śāntarakṣita. With the Commentary of Kamalaśīla*. Ed. with an Introduction in Sanskrit, with a Foreword by [Benoytosh Bhattacharyya]. 2 Vols. Gaekwad's Oriental Series 30 & 31, Oriental Institute, Baroda 1926.
- TSaP = Kamalaśīla: *Tattva-saṁgraha-pañjikā*. See: TSa.

-
- Vip = Śāntarakṣita: *Vipañcitārthā*. Rāhula Sāṃkṛtyāyana (ed.): *ācārya-Dharmakīrtteḥ Vādanyāyaḥ ācārya-Śāntarakṣitapraṇīṭayā Vipañcitārthābhīdhyā tīkayā saṃvalitaḥ*. Appendix to J.B.O.R.S. Vols. XXI & XXII, Patna 1935–1936.
- VN = Dharmakīrti: *Vāda-nyāya*. Michael Torsten Much: *Dharmakīrtis Vādanyāyaḥ. Teil I: Sanskrit-Text*. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprache und Kulturen Südasiens 25, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 1991.
- WEZLER 1969 = Wezler, Albrecht: ‘Dignāga’s Kritik an der Schlußlehre des Nyāya und die Deutung von Nyāyasūtra 1.1.5’, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Supplementa I.3. (1969) 836–842.
- WEZLER 1975 = Wezler, Albrecht: ‘Zur Identität der “Ācāryāḥ” und “Vyākhyātāraḥ” in Jayantabhaṭṭas Nyāyamañjarī’, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 19 (1975) 137–146.